



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,574	10/11/2000	Jack Lau	4522/8	4748

23548 7590 05/16/2006
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960

EXAMINER

OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/686,574	Applicant(s) LAU ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael N. Opsasnick	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-22,24-34 and 61-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-22,24-34 and 61-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 5-22,24-34,61-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiedler (6804638) in view of Dye (6370631).

As per claims 5-8,15-17,22,61-64, Fiedler (6804638) teaches a method for storing sets of digital signals in a compressed format in a computer disc storage device representing audio segments (as storing audio segments → col. 4 lines 19-30; onto a hard drive → col. 3 lines 1-7) comprising:

“stored in an uncompressed format....first memory” as storing the captured data (col. 7 lines 23-30);

“compressing each set of signals” as retrieving stored data and compressing (col. 7 lines 42-47);

“storing each set of signals....compressed format” as re-storing the compressed data for the purpose of creating more memory space for the newly recorded uncompressed data (col. 7 lines 34-40);

Fiedler (6804638) exchange of uncompressed/compressed data comprises of a memory buffer structure storing audio/pixel information (col. 4 lines 22-43), wherein the memory buffer structure contains a plurality of memory banks (acquisition buffers – abstract, output buffers – col. 11 lines 58-65; and the like). The swapping of data from these buffers is detailed in col. 6 line 55 – col. 7 line 19 of Fiedler.

Fiedler (6804638) teaches the use of these memory structures for storing differently formatted/compressed data, in fact, teaches the transfer of uncompressed data from one memory structure to another; however, Fiedler (6804638) does not explicitly teach compressing the transferred uncompressed data and re-storing the newly compressed data within that memory structure. Dye (6370631), however, teaches a memory controller (IMC) (Figs. 7-15) that includes a compression/decompression algorithm (col. 8 lines 15-24; col. 9 lines 4-19; col. 9 lines 4-19) that performs compression of decompressed information to the memory area (Fig. 12, taking normal data and compressing to compressed data) as well as compression of normal data from the cpu cache to compressed data of disk (Fig. 15), as well as decompression of compressed memory (Fig. 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data storage to modify the memory structure of Fiedler with an IMC device as taught by Dye (6370631) because it would advantageously improve memory access times, as well as reducing the burden the CPU (Dye (6370631), col. 9 lines 19-26).

As per claims 9-11, the combination of Fiedler (6804638) in view of Dye (6370631) teaches storing the differently compressed signals into different memory devices, including a hard disc (Fiedler (6804638) col. 3 lines 1-12).

As per claims 12,19,21,26, the combination of Fiedler (6804638) in view of Dye (6370631) teaches the use of old and well known compression algorithms (Fiedler (6804638), col. 7 lines 42-43, which would include the MP3 format).

As per claims 13,14, the combination of Fiedler (6804638) in view of Dye (6370631) teaches the compressed stored signals as audio signals (Fiedler (6804638), col. 4 lines 30-35).

As per claim 18, the combination of Fiedler (6804638) in view of Dye (6370631) teaches retrieving stored signals for compression after the storage of such uncompressed data (Fiedler (6804638), as retrieving the captured data → col. 7 lines 38-42).

As per claim 20, the combination of Fiedler (6804638) in view of Dye (6370631) teaches retrieving and compression of sets of signals one set at a time (Fiedler (6804638), as reserving memory to perform recording, storage, and compression, one set at a time → col. 78 lines 10-22).

As per claim 22, the combination of Fiedler (6804638) in view of Dye (6370631) teaches compression/decompression step using a predetermined priority Fiedler (6804638), (as deferring storage (including compression) so as to allow the user to cancel data capture → col. 7 lines 26-30; Fiedler's array of acquisition buffer records can be construed as an audio track – col. 4 lines

Art Unit: 2626

33-60; col. 10 lines 1-30; col. 30 lines 1-10). This correlation between audio tracks and the memory buffer of Fielder follows for claims 24-27 as well.

As per claim 24, the combination of Fiedler (6804638) in view of Dye (6370631) teaches recording (compression) occurs at user's request, but cannot be performed during playback (Fiedler (6804638), decompression) → col. 8 line 45 – col. 9 line 27.

As per claim 25, the combination of Fiedler (6804638) in view of Dye (6370631) teaches playback (including retrieval) after data capture (Fiedler (6804638), Fig. 6a-6b).

As per claim 27, the combination of Fiedler (6804638) in view of Dye (6370631) teaches the uncompressed retrieval and compression, of a set of signals, one set at a time (Fiedler (6804638), as alternating recording/playback -- this technique includes the compression of the stored uncompressed data → col. 6 lines 55-65).

System claims 28-34 are similar in scope to the method claims 17-22, implemented on a processor (col. 4 lines 20-35; Fig. 1), and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 2/22/2006 but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. As per the arguments presented against the Fiedler reference, examiner notes the

Art Unit: 2626

introduction of the Dye reference applied to the amended claim language. Examiner appreciates applicant's representative concerns regarding the comments in the previous office action; the examiner would like to explain that generic phrases such as "clarity amendments" usually include a comment from the applicant regarding claim scope. The intended purpose of the first paragraph of the previous office action was to clarify this issue (and any irregularity, perceived or otherwise, was due to this discrepancy) . Based on page 2 of applicant's response dated 2/22/06 it is now clear to the examiner that the applicant did not intend to comment on claim scope with the phrase "the remaining claims are amended for clarity". The examiner also notes that an examination of the newly amended claims was performed in the Office Action dated 12/27/05 as evidenced by the listing of pertinent references found that could be applied to the newly amended claim language, as well as a brief synopsis of each pertinent reference.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2626


CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Richemond Dorvil, can be reached at (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mno
5/12/06


Michael N. Opsasnick
Examiner
Art Unit 2626